UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,672	02/27/2002	Jered Donald Aasheim	183343.01	6395
	7590 10/23/2007 CORPORATION		EXAMINER	
ONE MICROSO REDMOND, W			PATEL, HETUL B	
REDITIONE, W	11 70032-0377		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2186	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/23/2007	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com ntovar@microsoft.com a-rydore@microsoft.com

## Interview Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/087,672	AASHEIM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Hetul Patel	2186	

	Hetul Patel	2186					
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):							
(1) <u>Hetul Patel</u> .	(3) <u>Mark Niemann</u> .						
(2) <u>William Breen (Reg. No.: 45,313)</u> .	(4)						
Date of Interview: 09 October 2007.							
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2	r)  applicant's representative	)]					
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.		·				
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .							
Identification of prior art discussed: Ban (USPN: 5,799,168) and Blumenau (USPN: 5,875,478).							
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g	)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	//A.					
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview							
requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.							
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action	H·B·	atel	<del></del>				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Interview Summary

Paper No. 20071009

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments. Applicant's representative alleged that the combination of Ban and Blumenau would defeat the very purpose of Ban. Ban teaches a standarized flash driver installed on the CPU and sends the standarized commands that are then interpreted by "controllers" that are installed on the flash chip. Thus Ban places burden on the controller installed on the flash chip. On the other hand, the flash drivers resides as a component within an OS of the computer.

Examiner first pointed out that according to Fig. 3, the flash driver 306 is NOT within the OS 309 as claimed. Second, the controller is interpreted as a software entitiy in the Ban prior art and calling the combination of CPU and controllers a CPU as taught by Blumenau reference. This combination id not defeating the very purpose of the Ban because the functionality of the Ban and combination is unchanged and furthermore, the standarized CPU still will be used in the above combination.

Examiner suggested Applicant's representative to amend the claim(s) appropritely so it is supported by the original specification/figure(s) and present the response/arguments in the next official response to PTO.